

Amendments to the Drawings:

There are no amendments made to the Drawings herein.

REMARKS

Claims 11-43, all claims currently pending, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Greenfield et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,523). Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider these rejections in view of the following Remarks.

First, Applicant respectfully submits that cited portions of Greenfield et al. are not properly citable against the present application under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). As is explicitly recognized by MPEP 706.02(f)(1)(I)(B):

The 35 U.S.C. 102(e) date of a reference that did not result from, nor claimed the benefit of, an international application is its earliest effective U.S. filing date, taking into consideration any proper benefit claims to prior U.S. applications under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120 if the prior application(s) properly supports the subject matter used to make the rejection in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

(emphasis added).

In the present case, the Examiner cites Column 5, Lines 49-55 of Greenfield et al. as part of the rejection of all claims, which section of Greenfield relates to the instantiation and population of certain multidimensional objects. Applicant acknowledges that the subject matter of this portion of Greenfield can be traced back to, and is fully supported by, Greenfield et al.'s parent application, U.S. Patent No. 6,684,207, in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph (see Column 5, Lines 43-49 thereof). However, Applicant has reviewed the entirety of the provisional patent application of which U.S. Patent No. 6,684,207 claims the benefit, U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/222,088, and cannot find any support whatsoever for the subject matter disclosed in Column 5, Lines 49-55 of Greenfield et al., never mind sufficient support to satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. More specifically, Applicant can not find any disclosure whatsoever in

U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/222,088 of when instantiation and/or inflation is to occur.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the earliest effective U.S. filing date of the subject matter disclosed in Column 5, Lines 49-55 of Greenfield et al. is the filing date of the parent application, U.S. Patent No. 6,684,207, which is August 1, 2001. Since the present application was filed before that date (i.e., on February 16, 2001), Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter disclosed in Column 5, Lines 49-55 of Greenfield et al. (as well as any other disclosure in Greenfield et al. concerning when instantiation and/or inflation is to occur) is not properly cited as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that, even if the cited portions of Greenfield et al. were properly cited, Greenfield et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention, as claimed.

The present invention, as claimed, is directed to an adaptive instantiation and inflation technique which is advantageously different than all instantiation and inflation techniques of which Appellant is aware. More specifically, as illustrated in Figure 5, object model software 18 receives an indication at 58 that the object model 28 is being first accessed. At this point, object model software 18 instantiates and inflates objects which have been previously specified for up-front instantiation and inflation at 60. At 62, object model software 18 receives indications that objects are being accessed. Next, at 64, object model software 18 instantiates and inflates on demand any objects which were not already instantiated and inflated up-front. (see Figure 5 and Paragraph [0040]).

Claims 11-43 of the present application all require, among other elements, object model software: (i) which instantiates and inflates a predefined group of

specified objects up-front a first time the database is accessed, and (ii) which instantiates and inflates nonspecified objects which are not included in the predefined group of specified objects on demand as each of the nonspecified objects is accessed. Thus, Claims 11, 24 and 27 of the present invention require a two-stage, adaptive instantiation and inflation.

Greenfield et al., on the other hand, discloses only a single stage instantiation and inflation technique, which is the very prior art technique upon which the present invention is intended to improve. More specifically, the very portion of Greenfield et al. cited by the Examiner (i.e., Column 5, Lines 49-55) discloses that:

Accordingly, metadata is used to inform the OLAP application 101 about the data that is available within the relational database 121 in a manner so that the OLAP application 101 can define multidimensional objects for analysis. When the OLAP application 101 runs, the OLAP application 101 instantiates these multidimensional objects and populates them with data fetched from the database.

(emphasis added).

Thus, Greenfield et al. teaches single stage instantiation and population that takes place when the OLAP application runs. There is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of a selective instantiation and inflation of only certain specified objects when the OLAP application runs (i.e., step 1), and then an on-demand instantiation and inflation of nonspecified objects as they are accessed (i.e., step 2). Rather, Greenfield et al. discloses only a single step instantiation and population of all objects when the OLAP application runs. Applicant respectfully submits that this is completely different than what is claimed.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that cited portions of Greenfield et al. are not properly citable against the present application under 35 U.S.C.

§102(e). Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that, even if the cited portions of Greenfield et al. were properly cited, the claimed two-stage, adaptive instantiation and inflation technique of the present invention is not disclosed, taught or suggested in any way by Greenfield et al., nor is there any motivation provided in Greenfield et al. to modify the system disclosed therein to provide such a two-stage, adaptive instantiation and inflation technique.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, namely Claims 11-43, are patentable over the references of record, and earnestly solicits allowance of the same.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen P. McNamara, Reg. No. 32,745
Todd M. Oberdick, Reg. No. 44,268
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06905-5619
(203) 324-6155
Attorneys for Applicant